

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is being submitted with a request for continued examination (RCE), and constitutes the required submission. This Amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action dated September 6, 2007. Applicant has amended claims 3, 8, 11, 15, 32-36, 38-43, 46, and 62-76. Applicant has cancelled claims 47-61. Applicant has added new claims 77-79. Claims 1-15, claims 32-46, and claims 62-79 are now pending.

#### **Cancelled claims 47-61**

Applicant has cancelled claims 47-61. Claims substantially similar to claims 47-61 were previously restricted in a Restriction Requirement. Applicant inadvertently added claims 47-61 into the present application notwithstanding the restriction. Claims substantially similar to claims 47-61 are currently being argued in divisional application 11/472,965.

#### **Means-plus-function claims 32-46**

The Final Office Action stated that claims 32-46 are treated as apparatus claims rather than means-plus-function claims because claims 32-46 do not follow the format of means-plus-function claims.

Applicant traverses characterization advanced in the Final Office Action that the claims 32-46 are not treated as means-plus-function claims because they do not follow the means-plus-function format. Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, claims 32-46 have been amended to better comply with means-plus-function claiming format. Applicant respectfully requests that the amended claims 32-46 be treated as means-plus-function claims in any future proceedings.

#### **Objections to the Specification**

The Final Office Action objected to the disclosure for the following informalities: “in paragraph [0028] step (38) may actually be step (37) and step (39) may actually be step (38); and in paragraph [0020] applicant used the word “leftward” at line 4 while figure 2 shows rightward.”

Applicant agrees with these objections, and has amended paragraphs [0028] and [0020] according to the suggestions advanced by the Examiner in the Final Office Action.

No new matter is added by making the amendments to paragraph [0028]. The amendments simply address typographical errors. The original specification referred to initializing “all attribute values” as step 38. However, FIG. 3 clearly shows that step 37 recites, “initialize all attribute values.” Paragraph [0028] has been amended to properly refer to step 37. The original specification referred to initializing “current pixel index values ( $X_C$ ,  $Y_C$ ) to a first pixel of a first scan line of the bounding box, i.e.,  $X_{MIN}$  and  $Y_{MIN}$ ” as step 39. However, FIG. 3 clearly shows that step 38 recites, “ $X_C = X_{MIN}$   $Y_C = Y_{MIN}$ .” Paragraph [0028] has been amended to properly refer to step 38.

No new matter is added by making the amendments to paragraph [0020]. The amendment simply address typographical errors. As pointed out in the Final Office Action, FIG. 2 shows rightward, so “leftward” has been deleted from paragraph [0020] and “rightward” has been added in place of “leftward,” in paragraph [0020].

Paragraphs [0028] and [0020] have been amended according to the suggestions advanced by the Examiner in the Final Office Action. No new matter is added by the amendment. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the specification.

### **Objections to the Drawings**

The Final Office Action objected to the drawings because “step 37 shown in figure 3 is not described in the specification, see paragraphs [0027] and [0028].”

Paragraph [0028] has been amended to recite to step 37. As described above, no new matter is added to the specification in amending paragraph [0028]. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

### **Claim Objections**

The Final Office Action objected to claim 71 because of the following informalities: “at line 2 ‘to f issue’ appears to be a typo.” Applicant agrees with the Final Office Action on this point. Claim 71 has been amended to delete the “f” in line 2.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The Final Office Action rejected claims 62-76 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. According to the Final Office Action, these claims are programs per se because they are a program product and the code claimed in the body of the claim is a computer program rather than instructions causing a computer to perform the claimed functions.

Applicant traverses the rejection, particularly to the extent it is considered applicable to amended claims 62-76. Applicant does not concede that claims 62-76 were previously directed to non-statutory subject matter. Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended claims 62-76 to “instructions to cause one or more processors to.” Amended claims 62-76 are not programs per se and are directed to statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for claims 62-76.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Final Office Action rejected claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 15, 34, 35, 39, 42, 46, 64, 65, 69, 72, 73, and 76 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claims 3, 8, 11, 15, 34, 35, 39, 42, 46, 64, 65, 69, 72, 73, and 76 for purposes of clarification. Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

***Claims 3, 34, and 64***

The Final Office Action rejected claim 3 as being indefinite because, “this claim applies the coefficient matrix to each of the pixel within the rectangular area while parent claim 1 ceases evaluation upon determining that at least one pixel of the line falls within the triangle area and a current pixel no longer falls within the triangle area.” The Final Office Action rejected claims 34 and 64 for the same reason as claim 3.

Applicant traverses the rejections of claims 3, 34, and 64, particularly to the extent such rejections may be considered applicable to amended claims 3, 34, and 64. In accordance with amended claims 3, 34, and 64, the coefficient matrix is not applied to each of the pixels within the rectangular area. Instead, the coefficient matrix is applied to one or more pixels within the

rectangular area. Since one or more of pixels that are within the rectangular area fall within the triangle, determination of whether a pixel falls within the triangle can cease when “at least one pixel of the line falls within the triangle area and a current pixel no longer falls within the triangle area,” as recited by claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection for claims 3, 34, and 64.

***Claims 11, 42, and 72***

The Final Office Action rejected claim 11 as being indefinite because, “this claim’s rasterizer evaluates coordinates associated with the pixel values of the rectangular area while parent claim 1 ceases evaluation upon determining that at least one pixel of the line falls within the triangle area and a current pixel no longer falls within the triangle area. Thus, the metes and bounds of claims 1 and 11 are unclear.” The Final Office Action rejected claims 42 and 72 for the same reason as claim 11.

Applicant traverses the rejections of claims 11, 42, and 72, particularly to the extent such rejections may be considered applicable to amended claims 11, 42, and 72. In accordance with amended claims 11, 42, and 72, the rasterizer does not evaluate every coordinate associated with the pixel values of the rectangular area. Instead, the rasterizer evaluates one or more of the pixels in the rectangular area. Since one or more of the pixels that are within the rectangular area fall within the triangle, determination of whether a pixel falls within the triangle can cease when “at least one pixel of the line falls within the triangle area and a current pixel no longer falls within the triangle area,” as recited by claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection for claims 11, 42, and 72.

***Claims 15, 46, and 76***

The Final Office Action rejected claim 15 as being indefinite because, “this claim claims a cache memory to store at least a portion of the pixels, however, claim 1, did not generate any pixels, thus, in the claim language no pixels are present to be stored in the cache memory and it is not clear which pixels applicants intends to claim to be stored in the cache memory.” The Final Office Action rejected claims 46 and 76 for the same reason as claim 15.

Applicant traverses the rejections of claims 15, 46, and 76, particularly to the extent such rejections may be considered applicable to amended claims 15, 46, and 76. In accordance with

the amended claims 15, 46, and 76, Applicant specifies that at least a portion of the pixels within the rectangular area are stored in the cache memory. The amended claims 15, 46, and 76 overcome the rejection because they distinctly point out which pixels are being stored in the cache memory. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection for claims 15, 46, and 76.

### ***Claim 73***

The Final Office Action rejected claim 73 because, at line 2 “the vertex buffer” and at line 8 “the bounding data” lack antecedent basis in the claim.

Applicant traverses the rejection, particularly to the extent the rejection may be considered applicable to amended claim 73. The phrase “the vertex buffer” has been deleted in amended claim 73. Amended claim 73 is dependent upon claim 72. Claim 72 recites, “process the vertices to compute bounding data,” and therefore provides antecedent basis for “the bounding data” in claim 73. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection for claim 73.

### ***Claims 4, 35, and 65***

The Final Office Action rejected claim 4 as being indefinite because, “the problem is the claim claims ‘rectangle’ while the specification describes ‘triangle’. If the claimed rectangle is the bounding box then the claim does not distinctly claim the invention and in view of claim 1 the rectangle is the bounding box. Thus, the metes and bounds of the claim is unclear.” The Final Office Action rejected claims 35 and 65 for the same reason as claim 4. The Final Office Action characterized the claim as follows, “this claim claims determining whether the results of the equation are less than zero in order to determine if a current one of the pixels is within the rectangular area.”

Applicant traverses the rejection for claims 4, 35, and 65. As described in the specification, a triangular area is bounded by a rectangular area. A rendering engine has to check pixels within the rectangular area to determine whether the pixel is also within the triangular area. To determine whether a current pixel, located at  $(X_C, Y_C)$  within the rectangular area, is also within the triangle, the coefficient matrix  $M_C$  would be applied to the pixel located at  $(X_C, Y_C)$  to determine whether  $(X_C, Y_C)$  is within the triangle. Therefore, claim 4 states,

“wherein the rendering engine applies the coefficient matrix  $M_C$  to a current one of the pixels ( $X_C$ ,  $Y_C$ ) within the rectangular area.” The rendering engine has to check the pixels within the rectangular area to determine whether the pixels also fall within the triangular area. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection for claims 4, 35, and 65.

***Claims 8, 39, and 69***

The Final Office Action rejected claim 8 as being indefinite because, “the definition given for  $M^1$  does not correspond to the specification definition given at equation (6) page 6. Thus, the metes and bounds of the claim is unclear.” The Final Office Action rejected claims 39 and 69 for the same reason as claim 8.

Applicant traverses the rejections of claims 8, 39, and 69, particularly to the extent such rejections may be considered applicable to the amended claims 8, 39, and 69. Claims 8, 39, and 69 have been amended to recite the proper equation for  $M^1$ . Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection for amended claims 8, 39, and 69.

All rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 have been overcome. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of all 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Final Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 32, 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 62, 63, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73 and 76 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Watkins (US 5,598,517). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections to the extent such rejection may be considered applicable to the amended claims. Watkins fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, as required by 35 U.S.C. 102(b), and provides no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of modification to include such features.

In order to support an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), it is well established that a prior art reference must disclose each and every element of a claim. If a prior art reference fails to disclose any element of a claim, then rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is improper.

***Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15***

The Final Office Action misinterpreted the teachings of Watkins. Watkins fails to teach or disclose, “a rendering engine that defines a rectangular area of pixels that bounds a triangular area of the pixels,” as required by independent claim 1. Watkins recites, “In FIG. 1, individual

pixels are grouped in arrays of sixteen in square spans  $10^1$ .” Figure 1 of Watkins shows a triangle T overlapped with a plurality of spans  $10^2$ . Watkins only teaches the use of a plurality of spans and panels, where each span or panel only encompasses a portion of the triangle<sup>3</sup>.

Claim 1 requires, “a rectangular area of pixels that bounds a triangular area of pixels.” In accordance with claim 1, a rectangular area bounds the entire triangular area of pixels. In contrast, Watkins teaches a plurality of spans or panels that encompass the triangle. According to Watkins and contrary to claim 1, there is more than one rectangular area. Also, according to Watkins and contrary to claim 1, the plurality of rectangular areas does not bind the triangular area. Instead, according to Watkins, the plurality of rectangular areas encompass only a portion of the triangular area. In other words, according to Watkins and contrary to claim 1, a plurality of spans and panels encompass only a portion of the rectangular area. However, claim 1 requires that there be one rectangular area that bounds the entire triangular area. A plurality of spans or panels where each span or panel only encompasses a portion of the triangle, as taught by Watkins is not suggestion of a rectangular area of pixels that bounds a triangular area of pixels, as recited in claim 1. For this reason, Watkins does not anticipate claim 1.

The Final Office Action failed to support an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The cited art, Watkins, fails to teach each and every element of the claim. Watkins, particularly, fails to teach “a rectangular area of pixels that bounds a triangular area of the pixels,” as required by claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection for claim 1.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 12 are allowable insofar as they are dependent upon allowable claim 1. Applicant reserves substantive comment with respect to claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 12. In reserving comment, however, Applicant does not acquiesce to the rejections or interpretations of the prior art advanced in the Final Office Action.

Claim 11 is allowable insofar as it is dependent upon allowable claim 1. Additionally, Watkins fails to teach each and every element of claim 11. For example, Watkins fails to teach or disclose, “a bounding box generator that processes the vertices to compute bounding data that define the dimensions of the rectangular area,” as required by claim 11. Contrary to the claim 11, the dimensions of the span or panel, in Watkins, are not defined by the bounding data computed

---

<sup>1</sup> Col. 5, lines 28-29

<sup>2</sup> Figure 1 of Watkins

<sup>3</sup> Figures 1, 5, and 7 of Watkins

from the vertices. In Watkins, the dimensions of the rectangular area are predetermined. Watkins recites, “as illustrated, panel areas are square, defined by arrays of sixty four spans (eight-by-eight)<sup>4</sup>. Again, rectangular areas may be utilized incorporating differing numbers of spans, e.g. sixteen-by-sixteen or sixteen-by-eight<sup>5</sup>.” Thus, according to Watkins, the rectangular area dimensions are based on a pre-determined number of pixels or spans.

Claim 11 recites a different technique than that disclosed in Watkins. Contrary to the teachings of Watkins, claim 11 requires that the dimensions of the rectangular area be defined by the bounding data computed from the vertices. According to claim 11, the dimensions of the rectangular area are not pre-determined, as taught by Watkins. Instead of the dimensions being pre-determined, as in Watkins, claim 11 requires the dimensions of the rectangular area to be defined by bounding data computed by the vertices. Therefore, claim 11 claims a different technique than that disclosed by Watkins. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection for claim 11.

Claim 15 is allowable insofar as it is dependent upon allowable claim 1. Additionally, Watkins fails to teach each and every element of claim 15. For example, Watkins fails to teach or disclose, “the rendering engine defines the rectangular area as a function of the block size of the cache,” as required by claim 15. In support of the rejection, the Final Office Action recited “column 2, lines 37-43 and column 3 lines 14-20 teaches to one skilled in the art the spans or panels are defined to correspond to the block size of the frame buffer cache memory.” Applicant disagrees with these characterizations of the teachings of column 2, lines 37-43 and column 3 lines 14-20, and respectfully submits that the Final Office Action misinterpreted these teachings of Watkins.

Watkins recites, in column 2, lines 40-42, “by scanning select primitive areas in order, texture memory may be accessed in a relatively fast cache mode.” The Final Office Action failed to explain how accessing texture memory in a relatively fast cache mode teaches one skilled in the art that the rectangular area is defined by a function of the block size of the cache, as required by claim 15. Watkins recites in column 3, lines 16-18, “in accordance herewith, for both a texture memory and the frame buffer, small, very fast cache memories may be utilized.” The Final Office Action once again failed to explain how using small, very fast cache memories

---

<sup>4</sup> Col. 8, lines 8-12

<sup>5</sup> Id.



would have suggested a rectangular area that is defined by a function of the block size of the cache, as required by claim 15. In fact, Watkins fails to ever mention the block size of the cache memory.

Claim 15 recites a different technique than that disclosed by Watkins. In particular, claim 15 requires that the rectangular area be defined as a function of the block size of the cache, and Watkins fails to teach this element of claim 15. The Final Office Action failed to show how Watkins teaches or discloses the requirements of claim 15. Therefore, the Final Office Action failed to make a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection for claim 15.

***Claims 32, 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 46***

The Final Office Action rejected claims 32, 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 46 because they are very similar to apparatus claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15, and rejected for the same reasons. As described above, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15 are all allowable. Claims 32, 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 46 are allowable for similar reasons.

Applicant reserves substantive comment with respect to any of claims 32, 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 46. In reserving comment, Applicant does not acquiesce to the rejections or interpretations of the prior art advanced in the Final Office Action.

***Claims 62, 63, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 76***

The Final Office Action rejected claims 62, 63, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 76 because these claims are computer readable storage medium claims of apparatus claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15, and rejected for the same reasons. As described above, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15 are all allowable. Claims 62, 63, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 76 are allowable for the similar reasons.

Applicant reserves substantive comment with respect to any of claims 62, 63, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 76. In reserving comment, Applicant does not acquiesce to the rejections or interpretations of the prior art advanced in the Final Office Action.

Watkins fails to disclose each and every limitation set forth in claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 32, 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 62, 63, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73 and 76. For at least these reasons, the Final Office Action failed to establish a prima facie case for anticipation of

Applicant's claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 32, 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 62, 63, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73 and 76 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

### **Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Final Office Action rejected claims 3, 7, 34, 38, 64, and 68 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins, and in view of the incorporated by reference article "A Parallel Algorithm for Polygon Rasterization" published in Computer Graphics, Volume 22, Number 4, August 1988 by Juan Pineda and designated ACM-0-89791-275-6/88/008/0017 (referred to as Pineda herein). The Final Office Action rejected claims 13, 14, 44, 45, 74 and 75 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins in view of applicant admission of the prior art. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections to the extent such rejections may be considered applicable to the claims as amended.

Watkins, in view of Pineda, fails to disclose or suggest the inventions defined by Applicant's claims, and provides no teaching that would have suggested a rational reason for a person of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the claimed invention.

To establish obviousness, there must be an apparent reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make a modification or combination to arrive at the claimed invention. KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., No. 04-1350, Slip op. at 14. (April 30, 2007).

Consistent with KSR, the Federal Circuit has stated that there must be "some rationale, articulation, or reasoned basis" to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." Alza Corp. v. Mylan Laboratories, 80 USPQ2d 1001, 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (citing In re Kahn, 78 USPQ2d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2006)). The reason for modification need not conform to the particular motivation or objective of the patent applicant. KSR, Slip op. at 16. However, there still must be some need or problem known in the art that would provide a reason for combining elements in the manner claimed. Id. If Applicant can show that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have had any *rational* reason to arrive at the claimed invention in view of the prior art, the obviousness rejections must be reversed.

### ***Claims 3, 7, 34, 38, 64, and 68***

The Final Office Action rejected claims 3 and 7 by citing to Watkins, in view of Pineda, as teaching all the elements of claims 3 and 7. Claims 34 and 64 are rejected for the same

reasons as claim 3. Claims 38 and 68 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 7. Applicant traverses the rejections. Claims 3 and 7 are allowable insofar as they are dependent upon allowable claim 1. Claims 34 and 38 are allowable insofar as they are dependent upon allowable claim 32. Claims 64 and 68 are allowable insofar as they are dependent upon allowable claim 62. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections for claims 3, 7, 34, 38, 64 and 68.

Applicant reserves further substantive comment with respect to any of claims 3, 7, 34, 38, 64, and 68. In reserving comment, Applicant does not acquiesce to the rejections or interpretations of the prior art advanced in the Final Office Action.

***Claims 13, 44, and 74***

The Final Office Action rejected claim 13 as being unpatentable over Watkins, in view of applicant admission of the prior art. The Final Office Action stated that, “it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of applicants invention to use the teachings of Watkins in a prior art wireless communication device because it will provide the device with the advantages noted by applicant in the paragraph spanning pages 1 and 2 as well as paragraphs 6-10 at page 2.”

Applicant traverses the rejection, particularly to the extent applicable to the amended claims. Claims 13, 44, and 74 are allowable insofar as they are dependent upon allowable claims. Additionally, Applicant disagrees with characterizations advanced in the Final Office Action. The Final Office Action stated that one skilled in the art would have reached Applicant’s stated advantages by using the teachings of Watkins in a wireless device. However, Watkins does not achieve the advantages of Applicant’s claimed invention. In particular, Watkins fails to disclose the claimed techniques, which may reduce processing intensity and thereby reduce power consumption.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to use the techniques of Watkins in a wireless device, for the reasons advanced in the Final Office Action, i.e., because it will provide the device with the advantages noted by Applicant. In fact, the teachings of Watkins are computationally intensive, and therefore when used in a mobile device would not provide the Advantage of reducing power consumption.

Watkins teaches a technique of processing a plurality of spans and panels. In contrast, the pending claims recite a technique of processing only one rectangular area. The Final Office Action failed to show that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have used a computationally intensive technique of processing a plurality of spans and panels, as taught by Watkins, in a wireless device. Applicant's desire to keep computation processing low in order to reduce power consumption would not even be achieved by the techniques of Watkins.

To make a prima facie case of a rejection under obviousness for claim 13, the Final Office Action must show some reason why one skilled in the art would have used the teachings of Watkins in a wireless device. The Final Office Action failed to do so insofar as the Final Office Action relied on Applicant's own teaching of a desire to reduce power consumption, which would not even be achieved via the techniques of Watkins. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 13. Claims 44 and 74 are allowable for the same reasons that claim 13 is allowable, and therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections for claims 44 and 74.

Applicant reserves further substantive comment with respect to any of claims 13, 44, and 74 for future proceedings. In reserving comment, Applicant does not acquiesce to the rejections or interpretations of the prior art advanced in the Final Office Action.

#### ***Claims 14, 45, and 75***

The Final Office Action rejected claim 14 as being unpatentable over Watkins, in view of applicant admission of the prior art. The Final Office Action stated that, "It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants invention to use the teachings of Watkins in an integrated circuit because it will provide the device with the advantages noted by applicant." The Final Office Action rejected claims 45 and 75 for the same reason as claim 14.

Applicant traverses the rejection. Claims 14, 45, and 75 are allowable insofar as they are dependent upon allowable claims. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 14, 45, and 75.

Applicant reserves further substantive comment with respect to any of claims 14, 45, and 75. In reserving comment, Applicant does not acquiesce to the rejections or interpretations of the prior art advanced in the Final Office Action.

Claims 3, 7, 13, and 14 are allowable insofar as they are dependent upon allowable claim 1. Claims 34, 38, 44, and 45 are allowable insofar as they are dependent upon allowable claim 32. Claims 64, 68, 74, and 75 are allowable insofar as they are dependent upon allowable claim 62. Additionally, claims 13, 44, and 64 are allowable because the Final Office Action failed to establish a prima facie case for obviousness. Particularly, the Final Office Action failed to provide a rational reason why one skilled in the art would use the teachings of Watkins in a wireless device. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection for claims 3, 7, 13, 14, 34, 38, 44, 45, 64, 68, 74, and 75.

### **CONCLUSION**

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 17-0026. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

December 6, 2007

---

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-2779  
Telephone: (858) 651-7571  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

By:

/Matthew J. Evans/

---

Name: Matthew J. Evans  
Reg. No.: 56,530